



1 court apportion liability as to future costs between the parties?  
2 Order, ECF No. 907.

3 On March 9, 2012, Defendant TEO filed a request for  
4 clarification which states:

5 [W]e write to confirm that the questions the Court  
6 asked the Parties to address in the March 5, 2012  
7 Order are in addition to, not in lieu of, the  
8 issues the Court initially permitted the Parties to  
9 brief at the conclusion of the trial. Both parties  
assume this was the Court's intent, but request  
clarification from the Court if this shared  
assumption is incorrect.

10 Def's Req., ECF No. 908.

11 The parties are correct in assuming that the questions the  
12 court asked the parties to address in the March 5, 2012 order are  
13 *in addition to, and not in lieu of*, the issues the court initially  
14 permitted the parties to brief at the conclusion of trial.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: March 12, 2012.

17  
18  
19   
20 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26